

**OPINION 2335 (Case 3395)**

***Geophilus linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 (currently *Stenotaenia linearis*; Chilopoda): specific name conserved and *Geophilus sorrentinus* (currently *Stenotaenia sorrentina*; Chilopoda) Attems, 1903: specific name not conserved**

**Abstract.** The Commission has conserved the specific name *Geophilus linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 for a widespread European species of geophilomorph centipede currently referred to the genus *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847 by suppressing the name *Geophilus simplex* Gervais, 1835. The Commission has not approved the proposed suppression of the name *Geophilus forficularius* Fanzago, 1881, a putative senior synonym of *Geophilus sorrentina* Attems, 1903.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Chilopoda; *Stenotaenia*; *Stenotaenia linearis*; *Geophilus simplex*; *Stenotaenia sorrentina*; *Geophilus forficularius*; geophilomorph centipedes.

---

**Ruling**

- (1) Under the plenary power the Commission has suppressed the specific name *simplex* Gervais, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus simplex*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.
- (2) The Commission has not suppressed the specific name *forficularius* Fanzago, 1881, as published in the binomen *Geophilus forficularius*.
- (3) The specific name *linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus linearis* (specific name of the type species of *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
- (4) The specific name *simplex* Gervais, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus simplex* and as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

**History of Case 3395**

An application to conserve the specific names *linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 and *sorrentinus* Attems, 1903, both originally published in *Geophilus* Leach, 1814, for two widespread European species of geophilomorph centipedes currently referred to the genus *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847, of which *Geophilus linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835 is the type species, was received from L. Bonato and A. Minelli (*University of Padova, Department of Biology, Via Ugo Bassi 58 B, I-35131 Padova, Italy*) on 26 September 2006. After correspondence the case was published in BZN **64**: 160–165 (September 2007). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. The Case was originally sent to vote on 1 June 2008. At the close of the voting period on 1 September 2008 the votes were as follows: set of proposals (a) (for suppression of *simplex* Gervais, 1835) passed; set of proposals (b) (for suppression of *G. forficularius* Fanzago, 1881) needed revote. However, both sets of



proposals were part of a single voting paper and some Commissioners voted for the entire set. The Opinion was put on hold until the Commission had decided how to proceed with handling split votes. In November 2013, the Council voted for cancellation of the first voting round. There were also two ex officio votes (one for and one against cancellation). On 24 November 2013 the vote was officially cancelled in order to proceed with a new vote with two sets of proposals for each name separately.

### SET A:

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary power to suppress the specific name *simplex* Gervais, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus simplex*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *linearis* C.L. Koch, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus linearis* (specific name of the type species of *Stenotaenia* C.L. Koch, 1847);
- (3) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the name *simplex* Gervais, 1835, as published in the binomen *Geophilus simplex* and as suppressed in (1) above.

### SET B:

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary power to suppress the specific name *forficularius* Fanzago, 1881, as published in the binomen *Geophilus forficularius*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *sorrentinus* Attems, 1903, as published in the binomen *Geophilus sorrentinus*;
- (3) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the name *forficularius* Fanzago, 1881, as published in the binomen *Geophilus forficularius* and as suppressed in (1) above.

### Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 2013 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the two sets of proposals (above) modified from those published in BZN **64**: 162–163. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2013 the votes were as follows:

#### Set A:

Affirmative votes – 23: Alonso-Zarazaga, Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Ng, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, van Tol, Winston, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative vote – 1: Lim.

Abstained – 1: Minelli.

Pyle was on leave of absence.

#### Set B:

Affirmative votes – 7: Ballerio, Brothers, Krell, Lim, Winston, Yanega and Zhou.



Negative votes – 17: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Kullander, Lamas, Ng, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, van Tol and Zhang.

Abstained – 1: Minelli.

Pyle was on leave of absence.

### Comments from the first round (cancelled)

SPLITTING his vote, Kottelat said that these were two distinct cases with different issues. He voted for conservation of *S. lineaeris* (C.L. Koch, 1835) and against conservation of *S. sorrentina* (Attems, 1903). He saw no justification for the last three points. If the two parts could not be separated, he added that he would then have voted against the whole proposal. Voting AGAINST, Grygier said that the matters of *G. linearis* and *G. sorrentinus* were almost fully independent of each other and should have been voted on separately. The case for the former was much stronger, in terms of documented use of the junior name in the literature, so he might have voted in favour of it alone, but the voting paper called for a single vote on the entire proposal. SPLITTING his vote, Bouchet noted that stability of nomenclature was not a serious issue for a name that had been used in only eight papers since 1903. He also suggested that the identity of *Geophilus forficularius* could have been solved by designation of a neotype. Kullander, who voted AGAINST, said that the first choice in a case of confusion was to apply priority and that the prevailing usage clause set the limit of 1899.

### Comments from the new round

Voting FOR set A and AGAINST set B, Alonso-Zarazaga said he voted against set B because neither the identity nor the taxonomy of *Geophilus forficularius* were settled in a convincing manner and a neotype should have been selected for the latter species because it might have been a different species from *Geophilus sorrentinus*. Voting FOR both sets of proposals, Brothers said that in the case of *forficularius* Fanzago, 1881, although it might have seemed unnecessary to propose complete suppression for priority since its synonymy with *sorrentinus* Attems, 1903, was apparently not definitively established (it might turn out to be a valid species in its own right), and conditional suppression (only effective if *forficularius* and *sorrentinus* were considered to be synonyms) might have been more appropriate. He said that *forficularius* had not been used as valid since 1881 which meant that it had disappeared from usage (and had effectively been suppressed) anyway. Voting FOR set A and AGAINST set B, Harvey noted that, with only nine valid usages of *G. sorrentinus* and two published usages of *G. forficularius*, it did not seem that there was any compelling argument to overturn priority, so voted to retain the name *G. forficularius*.

### Original references

The following are the original references to the name placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*simplex*, *Geophilus*, Gervais, 1835, *Magasin de Zoologie*, 9(133): 9

*linearis*, *Geophilus*, C.L. Koch, 1835, *Deutschlands Insecten*, Heft 136. Pustet, Regensburg [without pagination].